REMARKS

In an Office Action mailed on May 7, 2003, an objection was made to claim 24; claims 16-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; and claims 16-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolarov in view of Zandi. Claim 24 has been amended to overcome the objection to this claim. Additionally, claims 16, 23 and 29 have been amended to overcome the § 112 rejections of claims 16-33. The § 103 rejections of claims 16-33 are addressed below.

Rejections of Claims 16-22:

As amended, the method of independent claim 16 includes providing wavelet coefficients that indicate an image. The bits of each wavelet coefficient are associated with a different bit order so that each bit order is associated with one of the bits of each wavelet coefficient. The method of claim 16 also recites for each bit order, coding the associated bits to indicate zerotree roots that are associated with the bit order.

The Examiner rejects independent claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kolarov and Zandi. As pointed out in the previous replies and in the previously filed appeal brief, Zandi neither teaches nor suggests for each bit order, coding associated bits to indicate zerotree roots *that are associated with the bit order.* (emphasis added). Furthermore, the Examiner fails to show where Kolarov teaches or suggests these claim limitations. The Examiner states that these claim limitations are not explicitly recited in Kolarov. However, the Examiner fails to point to any language that would teach or suggest or even imply these claim limitations. In this manner, Figures 4A-4C and the corresponding text in Kolarov simply test testing wavelet coefficients for bit significance. This language of Kolarov is directed to coding entire multiple bit wavelet coefficients for zerotree roots, not for each bit order, coding associated bits to indicate zerotree roots that are associated with the bit order. Therefore, for at least the reason that the combination of the cited references fails to teach or suggest all claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for independent claim 16.

Claims 17-22 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

Rejections of Claims 23-33:

The article of independent claim 23 includes a storage medium that is readable by a processor-based system. The storage medium stores instructions to cause a processor to provide wavelet coefficients that indicate an image. The bits of each wavelet coefficient are associated with a different bit order so that each bit order is associated with one of the bit of each wavelet coefficient. The article of claim 23 also recites that the instruction cause the processor to for each bit order, code the associated bits to indicate zerotree roots that are associated with the bit order. The computer system of independent claim 29 includes a memory that stores a program to cause a processor to provide wavelet coefficients that indicate an image. The bits of each wavelet coefficient are associated with a different bit order so that each bit order is associated with one of the bits of each wavelet coefficient. Furthermore, the program causes the processor to for each bit order, code the associated bits to indicate zerotree roots that are associated with the bit order.

For at least the reasons set forth above in the discussion of independent claim 16, neither Zandi nor Kolarov teaches or suggests a program or instructions to cause a processor to for each bit order, code associated bits to indicate zerotree roots. As pointed out above in previous communications, Zandi teaches zerotree encoding on a coefficient basis. Although the Examiner contends that Kolarov somehow teaches (but admits that Kolarov fails to explicitly teach) such coding, the Examiner fails to point to any language of Kolarov supporting this position. Simply testing a wavelet coefficient for bit significance does not constitute for each bit order, coding associated bits to indicate zerotree roots that are associated with the bit order.

Therefore, for at least the reason that the combination of Zandi and Kolarov fails to teach or suggests all claim limitations, a *prima face* case of obviousness has not been established for either independent claim 23 or independent claim 29.

Claims 24-28 and 30-33 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the §§ 103 and 112 rejections and a favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance are requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0210US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 7, 2003

Fred G. Pruner, Jr., Reg. No. 40,779
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024
(713) 468-8880 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]